

1

## 2

3

4

5

6

7

) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

9

10

13

14

15

1 position was properly allocated. On September 25, 2000, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the  
2 Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject  
3 of this proceeding.

4  
5 By letter dated October 9, 2000, Appellant provided her specific exceptions to the Director's  
6 determination. Appellant asked that her position be reallocated to the either the Accountant 3 or the  
7 Cost Reimbursement Analyst 1 classification.

8  
9 Appellant previously appealed the allocation of her position. In that appeal, Appellant requested  
10 that her position be reallocated to the Accountant 3 or the Financial Coordinator 1 classification.  
11 On February 24, 1999, the Board issued a decision denying the appeal. The Board concluded that  
12 Appellant's position was fully described by the Accountant 2 classification.

13  
14 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that her representative failed to represent  
15 her interests at the Director's review which led the Director's designee to incorrectly conclude that  
16 Appellant does not understand her job. Appellant contends that management failed to assist her in  
17 writing her CQ and that she lost her prior appeal to the Board because of her lack of knowledge of  
18 the reallocation process. Appellant asserts that she provides technical support and information to  
19 management when she answers their questions, that she prepares work sheets, monthly reports and  
20 financial reports. Appellant argues that management uses the information she provides to forecast  
21 revenues and to determine budget expenditures. Appellant contends that her duties and  
22 responsibilities go beyond the Accountant 2 classification, that she is on the employment register  
23 for the Accountant 3, and that on a best fit basis, her position should be reallocated to a cost  
24 coordinator position.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the Cost Reimbursement Analyst  
2 1 classification is unique to the Department of Social and Health Services and does not describe the  
3 type of work that Appellant performs. Respondent further argues that while cost reimbursement  
4 duties are performed by ESD staff, these duties are performed by staff in the fiscal and budget  
5 office, not by staff in the Treasurer's Office where Appellant works. Respondent asserts that there  
6 has been no change in Appellant's duties and responsibilities since her previous appeal and that her  
7 position continues to be best described by the Accountant 2 classification.

8  
9 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly  
10 allocated to the Accountant 2 classification should be affirmed.

11  
12 **Relevant Classifications.** Accountant 2, class code 12120; Accountant 3, class code 12140; and  
13 Cost Reimbursement Analyst 1, class code 12270.

14  
15 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
16 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
17 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
18 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
19 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
20 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
21 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
22 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

23  
24 Appellant expressed her concerns about filling out the CQ without management's assistance. The  
25 Board has frequently stated that a CQ that is completed by an incumbent should be used to allocate  
26 the incumbent's position. Management is not required to assist an employee with completing the

1 CQ. In this case, Appellant signed and submitted a CQ with her reallocation request. She has not  
2 shown that the CQ did not accurately describe her duties and responsibilities.

3  
4 Appellant works in the Treasurer's Office of the Employment Security Department. The  
5 Treasurer's Office accounts for the unemployment insurance funds and tracks funds to ensure that  
6 they are available to cover the expenditures.

7  
8 The Cost Reimbursement Analyst 1 classification is a Department of Social and Health Services  
9 (DSHS) agency unique class. Appellant works for the Employment Security Department.  
10 Therefore, allocation to a DSHS classification is not appropriate. Furthermore, Appellant does not  
11 review financial statements, organization structures, and service delivery modes to establish  
12 reimbursement rates for vendors of department programs nor does she assist in developing and  
13 administering the budget for an automated cost allocation system or preparing reports for claiming  
14 Federal matching funds.

15  
16 The Accountant 3 classification is a lead or supervisory classification. Appellant has failed to  
17 provide any information to support her claim that she is performing duties at this level. Appellant is  
18 not assigned lead or supervisory duties. Furthermore, a majority of Appellant's duties and  
19 responsibilities do not fall within at least four of the nine functions listed in the distinguishing  
20 characteristics of the Accountant 3 classification. Therefore, allocation to the Accountant 3  
21 classification is not appropriate.

22  
23 Appellant's position continues to be fully described by the Accountant 2 classification. She  
24 performs a variety of accounting functions within the Treasurer's Office as required by the  
25 definition of the class. The majority of Appellant's work falls within the duties listed in the  
26 distinguishing characteristics of the Accountant 2 classification. Appellant analyses data and

1 financial statements and provides information and advice to management. Appellant's duties and  
2 responsibilities are best described by the Accountant 2 classification.

3  
4 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's  
5 determination, dated September 5, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

6  
7 **ORDER**

8 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is  
9 denied and the Director's determination, dated September 5, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy  
10 is attached.

11 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

12  
13 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

14  
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

16  
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member